

Criminal Code

made. But we are only on the ninth one; it is No. 10 but it is really the ninth because we dealt with No. 8 and went on to No. 10. This raises a pretty horrendous proposition.

When we reach the amendments with regard to abortion there will be a great deal of honest and sincere feeling on that subject which will require and should have many days of discussion. I repeat that since we have had last evening and this afternoon, and will continue to have some time this evening, on the question of lotteries, and since many speeches dealt with the entire subject rather than being limited to the narrow points of amendment No. 10, which the Chair presumably could have insisted upon but which in its usual wisdom it did not do. I wonder whether we could not agree to end the debate on amendments 9, 10 and 11 by 9.30 this evening.

Mr. Woolliams: Or before.

Mr. Lewis: Or before, but at least by 9.30, and take the votes on everything up to No. 11. I suggest this merely for the consideration of hon. members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, according to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), we are bent on extending the debate. I want to make it clear that we intend to do so. It is as simple as that. We have no objection to a vote being taken on everything that has been discussed up to now, including the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

However, I think that amendments Nos. 9 and 11 moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) must also be discussed because we still have something to say, even though we may have to repeat in other terms what we already said, as the hon. member for York South remarked. We can express our argument differently, and we will surely use all our cleverness to stretch this debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. We have now completed up to amendment No. 10 and are down to No. 11. I agree with the suggestion with one exception. Do not let us set the hour of 9.30. We should be able to complete this discussion long before that. But let us set a target of 9.30 at the

[**Mr. Lewis.**]

latest with respect to lotteries. I agree that the debate has been useful, but everybody who has spoken and to whom I have listened has covered the whole subject in reference to all the amendments. They have not particularized.

In making this suggestion I am not trying to recommend any form of closure, but surely we should not set a target of 9.30. We have had a full discussion and we might, as reasonable people, be able to finish this matter as early as 5.30 or 8.30. I do not know why we have to say 9.30. Perhaps that is because it is near the closing hour. I think the suggestion made is a good one, but we should be able to complete discussion of this question before 9.30. We should be able to accomplish what we have to accomplish before that time. There are other points in this bill that I know many members want to talk about.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could now make the suggestion that at the dinner hour there be consultations among representatives of the parties to see if we can come to some agreement that will meet the wishes of all of us. I think there is a general desire to have some of the votes tonight, knowing that we cannot have them on Wednesday or Thursday and that there might not be a universal desire to have them on Friday.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We will have our representative there, Mr. Speaker. Naturally we are in favour of any reasonable arrangement that can be made, but we want to reserve our position to see where we stand at 9.30.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members know that the original decision was that amendments 1 to 11 would be voted on together. That was the official decision arrived at after hearing the views of all hon. members. I would not think the Chair could change this position now, unless there is agreement on the part of all hon. members. I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and concurred in by other hon. members, is probably very valid but that no change should be made to the original decision unless there is some measure of agreement following the usual consultations among hon. members. I would therefore proceed at this point to put to the house the adjournment proceedings.